

## **REMARKS**

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of 2/8/2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

### **The Office Action**

Claims 1-34 remain in this application.

Claims 1-15, 19, and 22-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,299).

Claims 16-18, 20, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Newell Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,666).

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of the background section of the present application.

Claim 18 is objected to due to an informality.

### **The Claims Distinguish over the References of Record**

**Claim 1** now calls for electronically receiving finishing job description information before commencement of a printing job. Precedence for this amendment can be found in the specification, for example, in the last paragraph of page 18. Allen fails to anticipate claim 1 in two respects; 1) Allen fails to electronically transmit the finishing job information to the finisher and 2) Allen fails to program finishing instructions at the finisher before printing the job. In contrast, Allen uses a computer-readable cover sheet that is printed with the print job to convey the finishing information to the finishing machine. The method of information conveyance taught by Allen is an optical transfer of a physically printed barcode after the print job is processed. For these reasons it is respectfully submitted that **claim 1** and **claims 2-32** dependent therefrom now distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Similarly, **claim 33** now calls for retrieving job segment and job model information from at least one database before a corresponding print job is initiated. As stated above, Allen fails to teach pre-emptive programming of the finishing device, only programming at the time of finishing. Finishing is outside the scope of Newell, and as such, it adds nothing to cure the deficiency of Allen. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 33** distinguishes patentably and unobviously over

the references of record.

Similarly, new **claim 34** calls for the finishing device to receive instructions for finishing the print media before the printing apparatus applies markings to the print media. As stated above, Allen teaches transferring the finishing instructions after the print job has completed.

Additionally, claim 34 calls for at least one media pathway leading from the printing apparatus to the finishing device that transports printed media to the finishing device. In contrast to claim 34, Allen teaches that a stack of papers (including the finishing instructions) has to be manually transported from the printer to the finisher. It is respectfully submitted that Allen does not anticipate this automated feature of claim 34, and that **claim 34** defines over the references of record.

**Claim 18** has been amended as the Examiner has suggested to cure the informality.

#### CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-34) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Pat Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

Date

5/4/05

  
Patrick R. Roche

Reg. No. 29,580

1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582